1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## ANTHONY ROSIER WILSON,

Plaintiff,

VS.

ROBERT NEUSCHMID,

Defendant.

CASE No. 18-cv-06744-YGR

ORDER DENYING AS MOOT REQUEST FOR **EXTENSION OF TIME** 

Re: Dkt. No. 8

The Court has received petitioner's motion for extension of time to file an opposition to respondent's pending motion to dismiss. (Dkt. No. 8.) Therein petitioner represents that the opposition is presently due on June 29, 2019 and "requests an extension of time for 30 days so that the traverse and reply memorandum will be due on Monday, July 29, 2019. (*Id.* ¶¶ 2, 4.)

The Court, in its April 12, 2019 order directing respondent to show cause as to why the petition should not be granted, provided that respondent may file a motion to dismiss on procedural grounds in lieu of an answer. (Dkt. No.  $6 \, \P \, 3$ .) The Court further instructed that petitioner shall file an opposition or statement of non-opposition to such a motion within sixty days of receipt of the motion. (Id.) Respondent such a motion to dismiss on May 29, 2019. (Dkt. No. 7.) Per the Court's April 12 order, petitioner's opposition or statement of non-opposition is presently due July 29, 2019, the date of the extension that petitioner now requests. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES AS MOOT** petitioner's request. The Court also notes that per the April 12 order, any motion for an extension of time must be filed no later than fourteen days prior to the deadline sought to be extended.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 27, 2019

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE